<u>REMARKS</u>

The Examiner objected to claims 1 and 4 because of informalities; rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yang ("Protocol Compatibility Tester for CDMA Mobile Systems (CMS)," IEEE, ICPWC 1996, pages 96-101). Applicant amends the specification; amends claims 1 and 4. Claims 1-5 are pending in the application.

<u>Amendments to the Specification</u>

In order to correct an obvious typographical error, Applicant amends the specification at page 4, lines 15-16 as follows: "The decoding device **14** also has a specific decoder **18** which is adapted ~~to interpret~~ especially for a specific protocol X." It is evident that the omitted language is a typographical error because it is inconsistent with the following language in the specification and claims as originally filed:

Page 2, lines 6-22: "The disadvantage of this generic decoding software approach is that the software is not as efficient as specific software adapted especially for the existing protocol. . . . This is because the loaded protocol descriptions have to be interpreted by the generic decoding software. . . . The alternative, as shown in Fig. 2, is to program a specific decoder for the protocol or protocols to be analyzed . . ."

Page 4, lines 16-17: "no interpretation takes place in the specific decoder"

Page 3, lines 15-16: "a specific decoder designed for a certain protocol description"

Page 3, lines 18-19: "the specific decoder which is particularly suited to the protocol being analyzed at that point in time"

Claim 1: "a specific decoder designed for a certain protocol description"

Claim 4: "a specific decoder for a certain protocol description"

No new matter has been added through this amendment.

<u>Objection to Claims 1 and 4</u>

The Examiner objected to claims 1 and 4 because of informalities.

Regarding claim 1, line 4, the Examiner writes that the term "adapted to" should be replaced with "configured to," and points to MPEP § 2111.049 for support. Applicant is aware of MPEP § 2111.049, but Applicant sees little practical difference between the terms

"adapted to" and "configured to." Furthermore, "adapted to" is clearly supported in Applicant's disclosure (e.g., page 2, lines 7-8: "software adapted especially for the existing protocol") whereas "configured to" is not. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

For improved readability, Applicant rephrases claim 1 as follows: "the generic decoder being adapted to . . ."

Regarding claim 1, line 6 and claim 4, line 7, the Examiner writes that the term "may be" should be replaced with "are" because it does not positively recite a limitation. The claim limitation is "the generic and specific decoders being reversibly connected," while the language "so that the generic and specific decoders may be updated separately" merely describes a consequence of that limitation. (For example: "X and Y being detachably connected, so that X and Y may be detached.") To simplify the issue, Applicant amends claims 1 and 4 by removing the language "so that the generic and specific decoders may be updated separately," thus rendering the objection moot.

No new matter has been added through these amendments.

For these reasons, Applicant requests that the objections to claims 1 and 4 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yang.

Applicant amends claims 1 and 4 by adding the limitation "the specific decoder supplementing the generic decoder in realtime." These amendments do not constitute new matter because they are supported in the specification as originally filed at page 3, lines 16-19: ("The generic decoder is limited to a certain size so as not to cause runtimes of an unwanted scale, and is supplemented by the specific decoder . . .") and page 2, line 9 ("[Generic decoding software may cause] run times which impact realtime applications").

With regard to claims 1 and 4 as so amended, Yang does not describe "the specific decoder supplementing the generic decoder in realtime." As discussed at length on page 5 of Applicant's response dated February 9, 2006, Yang's PAST decodes protocols either exclusively within a PAST Interface Controller (PIC) or within a personal computer, which

the Examiner equates with a generic and a specific decoder, but one does not supplement the other, and certainly not in realtime. For this reason, claims 1 and 4 are not anticipated by Yang. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, and 5 are allowable because they depend from claims 1 or 4, both of which are allowable as discussed above. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection of claims 2, 3, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, allowance of claims 1-5 are urged, and such action and the issuance of this case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Wolfgang Bartsch

By: /Michael A. Nelson/

Michael A. Nelson
Reg. No. 59,450
(503) 627-1785 (Voice)
(503) 627-7119 (Fax)

August 16, 2007

Tektronix, Inc.
P.O. Box 500
Delivery Station 50-LAW
Beaverton, OR 97077